

Singular Lagrangians in supermechanics

JOSÉ F. CARIÑENA

Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain.

HÉCTOR FIGUEROA

Escuela de Matemática, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica.

Abstract

The time evolution operator K is introduced in the graded context and its main properties are discussed. In particular, the operator K is used to analyze the projectability of constraint functions arising in the Lagrangian formalism for singular Lagrangians.

Keywords: time evolution operator, supervector fields along a morphism, Hamiltonian and Lagrangian constraints.

1991 MSC numbers: Primary: 58A50, 58C50. Secondary: 70H33

PACS numbers: 03.20+i, 02.90+p, 11.30.pb.

1. Introduction

The relevance of systems defined by singular Lagrangians for fundamental physical theories (generally covariant, Yang Mills and string theories) is nowadays fully understood. They are the only possibility for the occurrence of gauge freedom. Constraints, gauge invariance, gauge fixing, etc, are now concepts of common use in these theories. All of them are better understood when using an appropriate geometric framework, and the use of modern tools of Differential Geometry has very much clarified the different aspects of the theory of singular systems started by Bergmann [2] and Dirac [13].

The connection between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms of regular systems, given by the Legendre transformation, needs a more careful study and makes use of finer tools in the case of singular Lagrangians. In this case, constraint functions determining the submanifold in which the dynamical equation has a consistent solution will appear. Moreover, in the Lagrange approach there will be more constraints functions determining the submanifold in which the dynamics admits a solution that is the restriction of a second order differential equation vector field. It has been shown that the relation among the constraint functions arising in the Lagrangian formalism and those of the Hamiltonian one can be established by means of a differential operator K , first introduced by Kamimura [19] and later used by Batlle *et al* [1], and whose geometric interpretation was given in [16] and [8]. For a recent review of these objects see [17]. The theory of sections along maps is the key point for establishing the operator K . In fact, vector fields along a map, or relative vector fields along a map according to [24], simplify and clarify most constructions in classical mechanics [3, 9,10] and they have recently been used in classical field theories [14].

On the other hand, the necessity of incorporating anticommuting variables for describing dynamical systems with fermionic degrees of freedom has lead to the development of

the so-called supermechanics [18]. Moreover, it has been shown to be quite useful not only in physics but also in mathematics, particularly in the study of the geometry associated to a Lie algebroid, mainly due to the Vaintrob Theorem [28].

Our aim in this paper is to discuss the generalization in the graded context of the operator K , also called relative Hamiltonian vector field in [24], which allows us to relate in this way constraint functions arising in Hamilton formalism for singular systems with those of the Lagrange approach. Our intention here is not to do a complete description of the theory of constraints in supermechanics, but rather to introduce some elements to convince the reader that this theory may be developed along parallel lines to the theory of constraints in classical mechanics. The main difficulty in this enterprise lies in that the information of a graded manifold is encoded in the sheaf of superfunctions, instead of the underlying manifold. Indeed, in the transition to the supermechanics setting the use of the concepts of sections along a map is even more necessary because of the inconvenience of working with points in graded geometry. Thus one is forced to take an algebraic approach, which replaces all the intrinsic constructions that are based on points of the manifold in the classical case. The interesting point is that this is accomplished by using vector fields and forms along a morphism of supermanifolds in the same way they were used in [9,10] in the classical setting. See [4-7] for details.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is devoted to set our notation and, for the reader convenience, we describe the material from the theory of graded manifolds that will be used in later Sections. In particular, we recall the concepts of vector fields and graded forms along a morphism, and particular examples are given.

In Section 3 we introduce, in the graded context, the time evolution operator K associated to a super-Lagrangian function L , and we discuss its main properties, in order to study the Lagrangian constraints associated to a singular Lagrangian and the connection with their Hamiltonian counterpart. Finally, Section 4 analyzes the projectability of Lagrangian constraint functions using the operator K .

2. Basic notation and background.

Naturally, the arena to develop Lagrangian or Hamiltonian supermechanics will be a suitable generalization, to the graded context, of the tangent and cotangent manifold of the configuration space. Surprisingly enough, even this requires some attention. The point is that the superobjects that have the right geometrical structure: the tangent or cotangent superbundles, introduced by Sánchez-Valenzuela in [25], are too big, as their dimensions are $(2m + n, 2n + m)$, if the dimension of the starting graded manifold $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathcal{A})$ (the configuration superspace) is (m, n) . This can be fixed by considering the subsupermanifolds of dimension $(2m, 2n)$, introduced by Ibort and Marín in [18], which, nonetheless, do not have all the geometrical richness that one is used to; for instance, supervector fields, that is, derivations of $\mathcal{A}$, can be considered as section of the tangent superbundle STM , but not of the tangent supermanifold $T\mathcal{M}$. Thus, it is advisable to define and study the main properties of the relevant objects in STM , but to perform the computations and the interpretations after the restriction to $T\mathcal{M}$ [5].

For the reader convenience and to fix the notation, we shall describe the main objects that give the geometry of the tangent and cotangent bundles in the graded context, and

refer the reader to [5] for details. Through out we shall be working with supermanifolds in the sense of Kostant [20] and Leites [21].

A *supervector bundle* is a quadruplet $\{ (E, \mathcal{A}_E), \Pi, (M, \mathcal{A}_M), V_S \}$ such that V is a real (r, s) -dimensional supervector space, $\Pi: (E, \mathcal{A}_E) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{A}_M)$ is a submersion of graded manifolds, and every $q \in M$ lies in a coordinate neighbourhood $\mathcal{U} \subseteq M$ for which an isomorphism $\Psi_{\mathcal{U}}$ exists making the following diagram commutative:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{A}_E(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}))) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\mathcal{U}}} & (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}_M(\mathcal{U})) \times V_S \\ \Pi \downarrow & & \downarrow P_1 \\ (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}_M(\mathcal{U})) & \xlongequal{\quad} & (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}_M(\mathcal{U})) \end{array} .$$

Here $V_S := S(V \oplus \bar{\Pi}V)$ where $\bar{\Pi}$ is the change of parity functor [21, 22], hence $(\bar{\Pi}V) = (\bar{\Pi}V)_0 \oplus (\bar{\Pi}V)_1$, where $(\bar{\Pi}V)_i = V_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, 1$, and $S(V)$ is the affine supermanifold

$$(2.2) \quad S(V) := (V_0, C^\infty(V_0) \otimes \bigwedge (V_1^*)) .$$

Equivalence classes of supervector bundles so defined are in a one-to-one correspondence with equivalence classes of locally free sheaves of $\mathcal{A}_M$ -modules over $\mathcal{M}$ of rank (r, s) . The tangent and cotangent superbundles are the superbundles corresponding to the sheaves $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{A}) := \text{Der } \mathcal{A}$ and $\Omega^1(\mathcal{A}) := \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{A})^*$ respectively.

The main reason for considering the tangent superbundle $\{(STM, ST\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{T}, (M, \mathcal{A})\}$, and supervector bundles in general [25], is that their geometrical sections are in a one-to-one correspondence with the sections of the corresponding locally free sheaf of graded $\mathcal{A}$ -modules; in our case, with the sections of the sheaf $\text{Der } \mathcal{A}$, in other words, with the supervector fields over $\mathcal{M}$. Unfortunately, the use of the parity functor $\bar{\Pi}$ introduces some unwanted supercoordinates; the elimination of these coordinates lead to the tangent and cotangent supermanifolds [5].

Supervector fields, or graded forms, along a morphism are our main tool to describe supermechanics, in fact all the relevant objects can be defined as such [4–7]. This is so because of their algebraic nature and because the information of a graded manifold is concentrated in the algebraic part, that is in the sheaf of superalgebras.

If $\Phi = (\phi, \phi^*): (N, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{A})$ is a morphism of graded manifolds, a homogeneous *supervector field along* Φ is a morphism of sheaves over M , $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Phi_*\mathcal{B}$ such that for each open subset $\mathcal{U}$ of M

$$(2.3) \quad X(fg) = X(f) \phi_{\mathcal{U}}^*(g) + (-1)^{|X||f|} \phi_{\mathcal{U}}^*(f) X(g) ,$$

whenever $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ is homogeneous of degree $|f|$. The sheaf of supervector fields along Φ will be denoted by $\mathfrak{X}(\Phi)$. If X is a supervector field on $(M, \mathcal{A})$, an example of an element in $\mathfrak{X}(\Phi)$ is given by

$$(2.4) \quad \hat{X} := \phi^* \circ X .$$

Similarly if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B})$, then

$$(2.5) \quad T\phi(Y) := Y \circ \phi^*,$$

also belongs to $\mathfrak{X}(\Phi)$. We say that Y is *projectable with respect to Φ* if there exists $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $T\phi(Y) = \hat{X}$. Sometimes, we also say that X and Y are Φ -related.

$\mathfrak{X}(\Phi)$ is a locally free sheaf of $\Phi_*\mathcal{B}$ -modules over M of rank $(m, n) = \dim \mathcal{M}$; a local basis of $\mathfrak{X}(\Phi)(\mathcal{U})$ is given by

$$(2.6) \quad \partial_{\hat{q}^i} := \widehat{\partial_{q^i}}, \quad \partial_{\hat{\theta}^\alpha} := \widehat{\partial_{\theta^\alpha}},$$

if (q^i, θ^α) ($1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq \alpha \leq n$), are local supercoordinates on $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ [4].

The sheaf of *graded 1-forms along Φ* is the sheaf of $\phi_*\mathcal{B}$ -modules $\Omega^1(\Phi) := \mathfrak{X}(\Phi)^* = \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{X}(\Phi), \phi_*\mathcal{B})$. If ω is a graded 1-form on $\mathcal{M}$, $\hat{\omega}$ defined by

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{\omega}(\hat{X}) := \phi^* \circ \omega(X), \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{A}_M),$$

belongs to $\Omega^1(\Phi)$. Moreover, a local basis is given by the elements $d\hat{q}^i := \widehat{dq^i}$ and $d\hat{\theta}^\alpha := \widehat{d\theta^\alpha}$. On the other hand, if ω is a graded 1-form along Φ , then $\phi^\sharp\omega$ given by

$$(2.8) \quad \phi^\sharp\omega(Y) := \omega(T\phi(Y)), \quad \forall Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}),$$

is a graded 1-form on $\mathcal{N}$. As a matter of fact, it is possible to classify the graded 1-forms on $\mathcal{N}$ that come from graded 1-forms along Φ , when Φ is a submersion. The result is that $\Omega^1(\Phi)$ is isomorphic to the $\phi_*\mathcal{B}$ -module of Φ -semibasic 1-forms on $\mathcal{N}$ [4]. Naturally, we can extend (2.7) and (2.8) to arbitrary graded forms.

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{(E, \mathcal{A}_E), \Pi, (M, \mathcal{A}_M), V_S\}$ be a superbundle. A local *section of $\mathcal{E}$ along Φ* , over an open subset $\mathcal{U}$ of M , is a morphism, $\Sigma = (\sigma, \sigma^*): (\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{B}(\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}))) \rightarrow (\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{A}_E(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})))$, satisfying the condition $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{U}} \circ \Sigma_{\mathcal{U}}$, where the subscript $\mathcal{U}$ means the restriction of the morphism to the corresponding open graded submanifold. The set of such sections is denoted by $\Gamma_\Phi(\Pi|_{\mathcal{U}})$. When $(E, \mathcal{A}_E)$ is the tangent or the cotangent superbundle these sections are in a one-to-one correspondence with supervector fields and graded 1-forms along Φ , respectively [5].

In the case when the morphism Φ coincides with the projection Π of the supervector bundle, the identity morphism on $\mathcal{E}$ gives a canonical section. In the tangent superbundle $\{ST\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}\}$ the supervector field along $\mathcal{T} = (\tau, \tau^*)$ that corresponds to the canonical section is called the *total time derivative operator* and is denoted by $\mathbf{T}$. Whereas the Π -semibasic graded 1-form on $ST^*\mathcal{M}$ associated to the graded 1-form along Π , corresponding to the canonical section of the cotangent superbundle $\{ST^*\mathcal{M}, \Pi = (\pi, \pi^*), \mathcal{M}\}$, is called *the canonical Liouville 1-form* on $ST^*\mathcal{M}$ and will be denoted by Θ_0 . The restrictions of $\mathbf{T}$ and Θ_0 to the tangent and cotangent supermanifolds, that will be denoted in the say way, can be written, in the natural supercoordinates of these supermanifolds [5] associated to the supercoordinates q^i, θ^α of $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathcal{U} \subset M$, as

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbf{T} = \sum_{i=1}^m v^i \partial_{\hat{q}^i} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \zeta^\alpha \partial_{\hat{\theta}^\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m p^i dq^i + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \eta^\alpha d\theta^\alpha.$$

The reason to consider these restrictions is that although Θ_0 is formally equal to the canonical 1-form of the cotangent bundle in non-graded geometry, it turns out that the graded 2-form $-d\Theta_0$ is always degenerate, whereas the restriction of Θ_0 to the cotangent supermanifold $T^*\mathcal{M}$ gives a non-degenerate graded 2-form $\omega_0 := -d\Theta_0$.

Using the abbreviation $T\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ for $T\mathcal{A}(\tau^{-1}(U))$, we associate to each superfunction $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ the superfunction $f^V \in T\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ defined by

$$(2.10) \quad f^V := \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial F}{\partial q^i} v^i + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta^\alpha} \zeta^\alpha,$$

where $F := \tau^*(f) \in T\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$. It turns out that a supervector field Y on $T\mathcal{M}$ is determined by its action on the superfunctions f^V . Thus, if X is a supervector field on $\mathcal{M}$, or a supervector field along $\mathcal{T}$, its *vertical lift* is the supervector field X^V on $T\mathcal{M}$ defined by

$$(2.11) \quad X^V(f^V) = \tau^*(X(f)), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{A}.$$

In local supercoordinates, if $X = \sum_{i=1}^m X^i \partial_{q^i} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \chi^\alpha \partial_{\theta^\alpha}$, then

$$(2.12) \quad X^V = \sum_{i=1}^m X^i \partial_{v^i} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \chi^\alpha \partial_{\zeta^\alpha}.$$

We are now in a position to introduce the superobjects corresponding to the objects that determine the geometry of the tangent manifold [12]: the *vertical superendomorphism* is the graded tensor field of type $(1, 1)$ $S: \mathfrak{X}(T\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(T\mathcal{A})$ defined by

$$(2.13) \quad S(Y) := (T\tau(Y))^V.$$

On the other hand, the *Liouville supervector field* Δ is the vertical lift of the total time derivative:

$$(2.14) \quad \Delta := \mathbf{T}^V.$$

If $Y = \sum_{i=1}^m Y^i \partial_{q^i} + \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Y}^i \partial_{v^i} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \Upsilon^\alpha \partial_{\theta^\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \Xi^\alpha \partial_{\zeta^\alpha}$ then,

$$(2.15) \quad S(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^m Y^i \partial_{v^i} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \Upsilon^\alpha \partial_{\zeta^\alpha}.$$

In analogy with ordinary Lagrangian mechanics, the *graded Cartan 1 and 2-forms* associated to a given Lagrangian superfunction L in $T\mathcal{A}$ are defined by

$$(2.16) \quad \Theta_L := dL \circ S \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_L := -d\Theta_L.$$

Since Θ_L is a $\mathcal{T}$ -semibasic graded 1-form, and $\mathcal{T}$ is a submersion, it has associated a unique graded 1-form $\hat{\Theta}_L$ along $\mathcal{T}$. In analogy with non-graded geometry, see [10], the restriction to $T\mathcal{M}$ of the section $FL: ST\mathcal{M} \rightarrow ST^*\mathcal{M}$ along $\mathcal{T}$ that corresponds to the graded 1-form $\hat{\Theta}_L$ is called the *super-Legendre transformation*. If L is even, locally, $FL = (fl, fl^*)$ is determined by the morphism of superalgebras $fl^*: T^*\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow T\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ described by the relations:

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} q^i &\mapsto q^i, & \theta^\alpha &\mapsto \theta^\alpha, \\ p^i &\mapsto \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i}, & \eta^\alpha &\mapsto -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \zeta^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

For more details on the super-Legendre transformation see [5].

3. The time evolution operator.

In Lagrangian supermechanics the dynamics of a system $(T\mathcal{M}, \omega_L, L)$, associated to a regular Lagrangian $L \in T\mathcal{M}$, is given by a vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(T\mathcal{M})$ satisfying the *dynamical equation*

$$(3.1) \quad i_\Gamma \omega_L = d E_L .$$

This uniquely defined vector field Γ satisfies, automatically, the second order condition [18], which can be stated in several equivalent ways. A very convenient one, suitable to generalization to higher orders [4,7], is

$$(3.2) \quad \Gamma \circ \tau^* = \mathbf{T} .$$

To abbreviate, we say that Γ is a SODE vector field (Second Order Differential Equation). When the super-Lagrangian L is singular both the existence and uniqueness of Γ are in jeopardy, and it is necessary to consider a submanifold of $T\mathcal{M}$ where (3.1) holds. Moreover, even on this submanifold (3.2) may fail, so both conditions have to be considered separately. Motivated by these issues we consider the following definition:

Definition 3.1. The **time evolution operator** $K: T^*\mathcal{A} \rightarrow T\mathcal{A}$, associated to a Lagrangian super-function, $L \in T\mathcal{M}$, is the unique supervector field along the super-Legendre transformation FL satisfying the *dynamical condition*

$$(3.3) \quad i_K \omega_0 = d E_L ,$$

and the *second order condition*

$$(3.4) \quad K \circ \pi^* = \mathbf{T} .$$

Since $\mathbf{T}$ is even, (3.4) implies that K is also even, hence $i_K: \Omega(T^*\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \Omega(T\mathcal{A})$ is the unique FL^* -derivation of bidegree $(-1, 0)$ [4] defined by

$$(3.5) \quad i_K f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad i_K df = K(f) .$$

In particular, one has

$$(3.6) \quad i_K(\omega \wedge \mu) = i_K \omega \wedge FL^* \mu + (-1)^{|\omega|} FL^* \omega \wedge i_K \mu ,$$

when ω is homogeneous. Conditions (3.3) and (3.4) are the same conditions as those used in [16] to define, in the non graded context, the time evolution operator, written in the algebraic language of operators to avoid the use of points of the underlying manifold.

Proposition 3.1. *There exist a unique supervector field along FL , $K \in \mathfrak{X}(FL)$ satisfying (3.3) and (3.4).*

Proof. In the local supercoordinates on $T\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ and $T^*\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ naturally associated to those on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$, see [5], equation (3.4) implies

$$(3.7) \quad K(q^i) = K \circ \pi^*(q^i) = \mathbf{T}(q^i) = v^i \quad \text{and} \quad K(\theta^\alpha) = K \circ \pi^*(\theta^\alpha) = \mathbf{T}(\theta^\alpha) = \eta^\alpha.$$

Assume now that $|L| = 0$. Since $\omega_0 = \sum_i dq^i \wedge dp^i - \sum_\alpha d\eta^\alpha \wedge d\theta^\alpha$, then, using (3.6) and (2.17),

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} i_K \omega_0 &= \sum_i K(q^i) d(fl^*(p^i)) - \sum_i K(p^i) d(fl^*(q^i)) \\ &\quad - \sum_\alpha K(\theta^\alpha) d(fl^*(\eta^\alpha)) - \sum_\alpha K(\eta^\alpha) d(fl^*(\theta^\alpha)) \\ &= \sum_j \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} + \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial \theta^\alpha} - \sum_i \delta_{ij} K(p^i) \right) dq^j \\ &\quad + \sum_j \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} + \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^j \partial \zeta^\alpha} \right) dv^j \\ &\quad - \sum_\beta \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \theta^\beta \partial v^i} - \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \theta^\beta \partial \zeta^\alpha} + \sum_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta} K(\eta^\alpha) \right) d\theta^\beta \\ &\quad - \sum_\beta \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \zeta^\beta \partial v^i} - \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \zeta^\beta \partial \zeta^\alpha} \right) d\zeta^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, as $\Delta = \mathbf{T}^V$, (2.9) implies $\Delta(L) = \sum_i v^i \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} + \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial L}{\partial \zeta^\alpha}$, therefore

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} dE_L &= \sum_j \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} + \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial \theta^\alpha} - \sum_i \delta_{ij} \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} \right) dq^j \\ &\quad + \sum_j \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} + \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^j \partial \zeta^\alpha} \right) dv^j \\ &\quad - \sum_\beta \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \theta^\beta \partial v^i} - \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \theta^\beta \partial \zeta^\alpha} - \sum_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta^\alpha} \right) d\theta^\beta \\ &\quad - \sum_\beta \left(\sum_i v^i \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \zeta^\beta \partial v^i} - \sum_\alpha \zeta^\alpha \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \zeta^\beta \partial \zeta^\alpha} \right) d\zeta^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if (3.3) holds (3.8) and (3.9) give

$$(3.10) \quad K(p^i) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} \quad \text{and} \quad K(\theta^\alpha) = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta^\alpha}.$$

This together with (3.7) imply the uniqueness of K . Moreover, it is easy to verify that (3.7) and (3.10) do define a supervector field along FL , which proves the proposition when L is even; the odd case is proved in the same way but (3.10) are different. $\square$

In the non graded case the time evolution operator was defined in [8] using the generalized Hamiltonian system defined on the mixed space $TM \oplus T^*M$ [26,27] as follows: given a Lagrangian function $L \in TM$ we consider on $TM \oplus T^*M$ the 2-form $\Omega := \text{pr}_2^* \omega_0$ and the function $D := \langle \text{pr}_1 | \text{pr}_2 \rangle - \text{pr}_1^* L$, where pr_i denotes the projection of $TM \oplus T^*M$ onto the i -th factor. If W denotes the graph of the Legendre transformation

$$(3.11) \quad W = \{ (v, p) \in TM \oplus T^*M : p = FL(v) \} ,$$

then the map $\overline{FL}: TM \rightarrow W$ given by $\overline{FL}(v) = (v, FL(v))$ is a diffeomorphism whose inverse is $\text{pr}_1|_W$ [26,27]. To simplify the notation we shall also denote the restriction of pr_i to W by pr_i . The time evolution operator $\tilde{K}: C^\infty(T^*M) \rightarrow C^\infty(TM)$ is defined by

$$(3.12) \quad \tilde{K} := \overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_2^*$$

where Z is any vector field on W satisfying

$$(3.13) \quad i_Z \Omega = dD.$$

Now, to prove that both definitions agree, we first notice that

$$(3.14) \quad \overline{FL}^* D(v) = D(v, FL(v)) = \langle v | FL(v) \rangle - \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_1^* L(v) = \Delta L(v) - L(v) = E_L(v) ,$$

and

$$(3.15) \quad \overline{FL}^* \Omega = \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_2^* \omega_0 = (\text{pr}_2 \circ \overline{FL})^* \omega_0 = FL^* \omega_0 = \omega_L .$$

Proposition 3.2. *If X is a vector field on TM such that $\text{pr}_1^* \circ X = Z \circ \text{pr}_1^*$, then $i_X \omega_L = dE_L$ and $X \circ \tau^* = \mathbf{T}$.*

Proof. Since $X \circ \overline{FL}^* = \overline{FL}^* \circ Z$, equations (3.14) and (3.15) yield

$$(3.16) \quad i_X \omega_L = i_X \circ \overline{FL}^* \Omega = \overline{FL}^* \circ i_Z \Omega = \overline{FL}^* (dD) = dE_L.$$

To prove the second assertion, for each $\alpha \in \Omega^1(M)$ let $Y_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*M)$ be the unique vector field such that

$$(3.17) \quad i_{Y_\alpha} \omega_0 = \pi^* \alpha ,$$

and let $Z_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(W)$ be such that $Z_\alpha \circ \text{pr}_1^* = 0$ and $Z_\alpha \circ \text{pr}_2^* = \text{pr}_2^* \circ Y_\alpha$, then

$$(3.18) \quad i_{Z_\alpha} \Omega = i_{Z_\alpha} \circ \text{pr}_2^* \omega_0 = \text{pr}_2^* \circ i_{Y_\alpha} \omega_0 = \text{pr}_2^* \circ \pi^* \alpha = (\tau \circ \text{pr}_1)^* \alpha ,$$

therefore, using (2.7)

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega(Z, Z_\alpha) &= -\Omega(Z_\alpha, Z) = -i_{Z_\alpha} \Omega Z = -(\tau \circ \text{pr}_1)^* \alpha(Z) \\ &= -\hat{\alpha}(Z \circ \text{pr}_1^* \circ \tau^*) = -\hat{\alpha}(\text{pr}_1^* \circ X \circ \tau^*) . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $Z_\alpha \circ \text{pr}_1^* = 0$,

$$(3.20) \quad \Omega(Z, Z_\alpha) = i_{Z_\alpha} i_Z \Omega = i_{Z_\alpha} dD = i_{Z_\alpha} d\langle \text{pr}_1 | \text{pr}_2 \rangle - Z_\alpha \circ \text{pr}_1^* L = i_{Z_\alpha} d\langle \text{pr}_1 | \text{pr}_2 \rangle .$$

Now, if q^i are local coordinates on M , v^i and p^i are the corresponding local coordinates on TM and T^*M respectively, and $\alpha = \sum_i \alpha_i dq^i$, then a simple computation in local coordinates, using that $Z_\alpha \circ \text{pr}_2^* = \text{pr}_2^* \circ Y_\alpha$ and (2.7), gives

$$(3.21) \quad i_{Z_\alpha} d\langle \text{pr}_1 | \text{pr}_2 \rangle = - \sum_i \text{pr}_1^* v^i \text{pr}_1^* \circ \tau^* \alpha_i = -\hat{\alpha}(\text{pr}_1^* \circ \mathbf{T}) .$$

Thus, $\hat{\alpha}(\text{pr}_1^* \circ X \circ \tau^*) = \hat{\alpha}(\text{pr}_1^* \circ \mathbf{T})$. Since α is arbitrary and pr_1^* is injective, it follows that $X \circ \tau^* = \mathbf{T}$. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *Let L be a Lagrangian superfunction. Then $\tilde{K}$ defined by (3.12) coincides with K as given by (3.3) and (3.4), i.e. $K = \tilde{K}$. This also proves that $\tilde{K}$ is independent of the choice of Z satisfying (3.13).*

Proof. Clearly $\tilde{K}$ is a vector field along FL , therefore it remains to prove that $\tilde{K}$ satisfies (3.3) and (3.4). By Lemma 2.1 of [4] and (3.14)

$$(3.22) \quad i_{\tilde{K}} \omega_0 = i_{\overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_2^*} \omega_0 = i_{\overline{FL}^* \circ Z} \text{pr}_2^* \omega_0 = i_{\overline{FL}^* \circ Z} \Omega = \overline{FL}^* \circ i_Z \Omega = \overline{FL}^* dD = dE_L .$$

On the other hand, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM)$ is such that $\text{pr}_1^* \circ X = Z \circ \text{pr}_1^*$, then by Proposition 3.2

$$(3.23) \quad \tilde{K} \circ \pi^* = \overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_2^* \circ \pi^* = \overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_1^* \circ \tau^* = \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_1^* \circ X \circ \tau^* = X \circ \tau^* = \mathbf{T} . \quad \square$$

We point out that our arguments were cast so as to hold also in the graded context. The only technical point is to define the Whitney sum of supervector bundles, which can be done exactly as in the classical case [15]. Moreover, the properties of K , discussed in what follows, will also be written in such a way so as to hold on supermanifolds by adding the supercoordinates that anticommute. Nevertheless, to simplify the notation, we shall work on a differential manifold M .

Notice that if X and Z are as in Proposition 3.2, and $g \in C^\infty(TM)$ is a FL -projectable function, say $g = FL^*(h)$, then

$$(3.24) \quad X(g) = X \circ FL^*(h) = X \circ \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_2^*(h) = \overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_2^*(h) = K(h) ,$$

therefore the operator K gives the time evolution for this kind of functions, and provides a reason for the name of the operator.

The main property of K is that its action on Hamiltonian constraints generates the Lagrangian constraints [1,8]. Before we see how this goes, we shall introduce another operator that is also used to compare Hamiltonian and Lagrangian constraints [11], but again we define it using an algebraic approach that can be generalized to the graded context. Since a vector field on TM is determined by its action on the maps f^V defined in (2.10), we associate to each $U \in \mathfrak{X}(FL)$ the vector field on TM defined by

$$(3.25) \quad \tilde{R}_L U(f^V) := U \circ \pi^*(f) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M).$$

Now, if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*M)$, then $FL^* \circ Y \in \mathfrak{X}(FL)$, so we can define an operator $R_L: \mathfrak{X}(T^*M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(TM)$ by

$$(3.26) \quad R_L(Y) := \tilde{R}_L(FL^* \circ Y) .$$

When $Y = \sum_{i=1}^m (Y^i \partial_{q^i} + \mathcal{Y}^i \partial_{p^i})$, then $R_L(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^m Y^i \partial_{v^i}$. In particular, if $h \in C^\infty(T^*M)$, and Y_h is the vector field such that

$$(3.27) \quad i_{Y_h} \omega_0 = dh ,$$

then

$$(3.28) \quad R_L(Y_h) = \sum_{i=1}^m FL^* \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial p^i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} .$$

Moreover, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM)$ is a vector field such that $X \circ \tau^* = FL^* \circ Y \circ \pi^*$, then by (2.13)

$$(3.29) \quad R_L(Y)(f^V) = X \circ \tau^*(f) = (T\tau X)^V(f^V) = S(X)(f^V) ,$$

so $R_L(Y) = S(X)$.

Lemma 3.4. *For each $h \in C^\infty(T^*M)$ there are vector fields X_h on TM such that $S(X_h) = R_L(Y_h)$, where Y_h is the vector field defined by (3.27).*

Proof. First we choose $Z_h \in \mathfrak{X}(W)$ such that $Z_h \circ \text{pr}_2^* = \text{pr}_2^* \circ Y_h$, then we take X_h such that $Z_h \circ \text{pr}_1^* = \text{pr}_1^* \circ X_h$. Now,

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{pr}_1^* \circ X_h \circ \tau^* &= Z_h \circ \text{pr}_1^* \circ \tau^* = Z_h \circ \text{pr}_2^* \circ \pi^* \\ &= \text{pr}_2^* \circ Y_h \circ \pi^* = \text{pr}_1^* \circ FL^* \circ Y_h \circ \pi^* . \end{aligned}$$

Since pr_1^* is injective $X_h \circ \tau^* = FL^* \circ Y_h \circ \pi^*$, so by the comment before the statement $S(X_h) = R_L(Y_h)$. $\square$

Note that X_h is by no means unique, but clearly the difference of two such vector fields is τ -vertical.

Proposition 3.5. For each $h \in C^\infty(T^*M)$

$$(3.31) \quad K(h) = i_{X_h} [i_\Gamma \omega_L - dE_L] + i_\Gamma d(FL^*h) ,$$

where X_h is any vector field such that $S(X_h) = R_L(Y_h)$, and $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(TM)$ is an arbitrary SODE vector field.

Proof. Given X_h and Γ , we choose vector fields U_h and V in $\mathfrak{X}(W)$ such that $U_h \circ \text{pr}_1^* = \text{pr}_1^* \circ X_h$, and $V \circ \text{pr}_1^* = \text{pr}_1^* \circ \Gamma$. If Z_h is as in the proof of the previous lemma, then,

$$(3.32) \quad i_{Z_h} \Omega = i_{Z_h} \text{pr}_2^* \omega_0 = \text{pr}_2^* \circ i_{Y_h} \omega_0 = \text{pr}_2^*(dh) ,$$

so

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} K(h) &= \overline{FL}^* \circ Z \circ \text{pr}_2^*(h) = \overline{FL}^* \circ i_Z \circ i_{Z_h} \Omega = -\overline{FL}^* \circ i_{Z_h} \circ i_Z \Omega \\ &= -\overline{FL}^* \circ i_{Z_h - U_h} \circ i_{Z - V} \Omega - \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{Z_h} \circ i_V \Omega \\ &\quad + \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{U_h} \circ i_V \Omega - \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{U_h} \circ i_Z \Omega . \end{aligned}$$

By the proof of Lemma 3.4, $Z_h - U_h$ is p -vertical, where $p: W \rightarrow M$ is the canonical projection. But $Z - V$ is also p -vertical since $Z(q^i) = v^i = V(q^i)$, hence $i_{Z_h - U_h} \circ i_{Z - V} \Omega = 0$.

On the other hand, by (3.14) and (3.15),

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{U_h} \circ i_Z \Omega &= i_{X_h} \circ \overline{FL}^* \circ i_Z \Omega = i_{X_h} \circ \overline{FL}^*(dD) = i_{X_h} dE_L , \\ \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{U_h} \circ i_V \Omega &= i_{X_h} \circ \overline{FL}^* \circ i_V \Omega = i_{X_h} \circ i_\Gamma \overline{FL}^* \Omega = i_{X_h} \circ i_\Gamma \omega_L . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (3.32),

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{Z_h} \circ i_V \Omega &= -\overline{FL}^* \circ i_V \circ i_{Z_h} \Omega = -i_\Gamma \circ \overline{FL}^* \circ i_{Z_h} \Omega \\ &= -i_\Gamma \circ \overline{FL}^*(d \text{pr}_2^* h) = -i_\Gamma d(\text{pr}_2 \circ \overline{FL})^* h = -i_\Gamma d(FL^*h) . \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.34) and (3.35) into (3.33) we obtain (3.31). □

When h is a Hamiltonian constraint, so $FL^*h = 0$, (3.31) reduces to

$$(3.36) \quad K(h) = i_{X_h} [i_\Gamma \omega_L - dE_L] ,$$

and the right hand side is a Lagrangian constraint [11,23]; actually, it is the constraint associated to h through the operator R_L . Thus, the operator K reproduces the Lagrangian constraints, while the operator R_L provides the non arbitrary part of the vector fields associated to a given constraint.

4. Projectability of constraints

In order to analyze the projectability of these constraints we consider the following lemmata.

Lemma 4.1. *The energy function E_L is FL -projectable.*

Proof. We have to proof that E_L is annihilated by all the elements of $\ker FL_* = \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) : X \circ FL^* = 0 \}$. Since $\tau^* = FL^* \circ \pi^*$, it is clear that vector fields in $\ker FL_*$ are τ -vertical. In particular, $i_X \theta_L = 0$ when $X \in \ker FL_*$, as $\theta_L = dL \circ S$. On the other hand, if Γ is a SODE vector field, and $X \in \ker FL_*$, then $[X, \Gamma](q^i) = X\Gamma(q^i) = X(v^i)$, so

$$(4.1) \quad S([X, \Gamma]) = X .$$

Thus, if $X \in \ker FL_*$,

$$(4.2) \quad X(E_L) = \mathcal{L}_X(i_\Gamma \theta_L - L) = i_{[X, \Gamma]} \theta_L - i_\Gamma \mathcal{L}_X \theta_L - X(L) = dL \circ S([X, \Gamma]) - X(L) = 0 . \quad \square$$

Consider the set $\mathfrak{M} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) : S(X) \in \text{Vker } \omega_L \}$, where $\text{Vker } \omega_L$ denotes the set of those vector fields in $\ker \omega_L$ that are τ -vertical, that is $\text{Vker } \omega_L := \mathfrak{X}^v(TM) \cap \ker \omega_L$.

Lemma 4.2. *$\mathfrak{M}$ coincides with the orthogonal complement of the set of vertical vector fields with respect to ω_L , $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{X}^v(TM))^\perp$.*

Proof. Since

$$(4.3) \quad \omega_L(X, S(U)) = -\omega_L(S(X), U)$$

for arbitrary X and U in $\mathfrak{X}(TM)$ [12, Section 13.8] (or see [18] for a proof in the graded context), then

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{X}^v(TM))^\perp &= \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) : \omega_L(X, V) = 0 \text{ for all } V \in \mathfrak{X}^v(TM) \} \\ &= \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) : \omega_L(X, S(U)) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) \} \\ &= \{ X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) : \omega_L(S(X), U) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \mathfrak{X}(TM) \} = \mathfrak{M} . \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.3. *The kernel of the Cartan 2-form associated to a Lagrangian superfunction is $\mathfrak{M}^\perp$, i.e. $\ker \omega_L = \mathfrak{M}^\perp$.*

Proof. Obviously $\ker \omega_L \subseteq \mathfrak{M}^\perp$. On the other hand, notice that $\omega_L(V_1, V_2) = 0$ if V_1 and V_2 are τ -vertical. This means that $\mathfrak{X}^v(TM) \subset (\mathfrak{X}^v(TM))^\perp = \mathfrak{M}$, therefore $\mathfrak{M}^\perp \subseteq (\mathfrak{X}^v(TM))^\perp = \mathfrak{M}$.

Now, $\partial_{q^i} \in \mathfrak{M}$ since $S(\partial_{q^i}) = \partial_{v^i} \in \mathfrak{X}^v(TM) \subset \mathfrak{M}$, therefore if $X \in \mathfrak{M}^\perp$

$$(4.5) \quad \omega_L(X, \partial_{q^i}) = 0 .$$

Furthermore, since $\mathfrak{M}^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{M}$, then $S(X) \in \text{Vker } \omega_L$, so using (4.3)

$$(4.6) \quad 0 = \omega_L(S(X), \partial_{q^i}) = \omega_L(X, S(\partial_{q^i})) = \omega_L(X, \partial_{v^i}),$$

and i being arbitrary, it follows that $X \in \ker \omega_L$. $\square$

The importance of the set $\mathfrak{M}$ lies in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *If h is a Hamiltonian constraint and X_h the corresponding vector field constructed in Lemma 3.4, then $X_h \in \mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. By (4.3) and (2.7)

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_L(S(X_h), X) &= -\omega_L(X_h, S(X)) = -\hat{\omega}_0(X_h \circ FL^*, S(X) \circ FL^*) \\ &= -\hat{\omega}_0(FL^* \circ Y_h, S(X) \circ FL^*) . \end{aligned}$$

But for an arbitrary $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*M)$,

$$(4.8) \quad \hat{\omega}_0(FL^* \circ Y_h, \hat{Y}) = FL^*(\omega_0(Y_h, Y)) = FL^*(df(Y)) = \widehat{df}(\hat{Y}) ;$$

therefore $\omega_L(S(X_h), X) = \widehat{df}(S(X) \circ FL^*)$. On the other hand, using local coordinates, it is easy to check that $\widehat{dh}(X \circ FL^*) = X \circ FL^*(h)$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM)$. Thus, if h is a Hamiltonian constraint $FL^*h = 0$, and

$$(4.9) \quad \omega_L(S(X_h), X) = \widehat{df}(S(X) \circ FL^*) = S(X) \circ FL^*(h) = 0,$$

so $S(X_h) \in \ker \omega_L$. □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $h \in C^\infty(T^*M)$ be a Hamiltonian constraint. The associated Lagrangian constraint $C_h := K(h) = i_{X_h}[i_\Gamma \omega_L - dE_L]$ is FL -projectable if, and only if, the vector field X_h constructed in Lemma 3.4 belongs to $\ker \omega_L$.*

Proof. Since E_L is FL -projectable there exist $H \in C^\infty(T^*M)$ such that $FL^*H = E_L$. Thus if $X_h \in \ker \omega_L$

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} C_h &= i_{X_h} dE_L = X_h \circ FL^*(H) = X_h \circ \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_2^*(H) \\ &= \overline{FL}^* \circ Z_h \circ \text{pr}_2^*(H) = \overline{FL}^* \circ \text{pr}_2^* \circ Y_h(H) = FL^*(Y_h(H)) . \end{aligned}$$

(Here we are using the notation as in the proof of Lemma 3.4).

Conversely, assume that C_h is a FL -projectable function and that $U \in \ker FL_*$, then $U(i_{X_h} dE_L) = U \circ FL^* \circ Y_h(H) = 0$, so

$$(4.11) \quad 0 = U(C_h) = U(i_{X_h} i_\Gamma \omega_L) = -\mathcal{L}_U(i_{X_h} i_\Gamma \omega_L) = -i_\Gamma \mathcal{L}_U i_{X_h} \omega_L - i_{[U, \Gamma]} i_{X_h} \omega_L .$$

Now, since $U \in \ker FL_*$, then U is FL -related to 0, therefore $\mathcal{L}_U \circ FL^* = 0$, so

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{L}_U i_{X_h} \omega_L = \mathcal{L}_U i_{X_h} FL^* \omega_0 = \mathcal{L}_U \circ FL^* \circ i_{Y_h} \omega_0 = 0 .$$

We conclude that

$$(4.13) \quad i_{[U, \Gamma]} i_{X_h} \omega_L = 0 \quad \text{for all } U \in \ker FL_* .$$

On the other hand, since $S(X)$ is τ -vertical, (4.1) gives $S(X) = S([S(X), \Gamma])$, therefore $V := X - [S(X), \Gamma]$ is also τ -vertical. Now, for $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TM)$ we can write

$$(4.14) \quad i_X i_{X_h} \omega_L = i_{[S(X), \Gamma]} i_{X_h} \omega_L + i_V i_{X_h} \omega_L .$$

Moreover, when $X \in \mathfrak{M}$, $S(X) \in \ker FL_* = \text{Vker } \omega_L$ [11, Prop. 3], then by (4.13) the first term of (4.14) vanishes, while the second one vanishes by Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.4, hence $X_h \in \mathfrak{M}^\perp = \ker \omega_L$. □

Thus, the Lagrangian dynamical constraints are exactly those that are FL -projectable, while the non-projectable ones are associated to the SODE conditions. Moreover, this partition of the Lagrangian constraints in two groups can also be explained in terms of the classification of the Hamiltonian constraints:

Theorem 4.6. *Let $h \in C^\infty(T^*M)$ be a Hamiltonian constraint, h is first class if, and only if, C_h is FL -projectable.*

Proof. If h is first class Y_h is tangent to $\text{Im } FL$, in other words $FL^* \circ Y_h = 0$. Then

$$(4.15) \quad \omega_L(X_h, X) = \hat{\omega}_0(X_h \circ FL^*, X \circ FL^*) = \hat{\omega}_0(FL^* \circ Y_h, X \circ FL^*) = 0.$$

Thus, $X_h \in \ker \omega_L$, so, by Theorem 4.5, C_h is FL -projectable.

On the other hand, if h is second class there exists another constraint k such that

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \neq FL^*\{h, k\} &= FL^*\omega_0(Y_h, Y_k) = \hat{\omega}_0(FL^* \circ Y_h, FL^* \circ Y_k) \\ &= \hat{\omega}_0(X_h \circ FL^*, X_k \circ FL^*) = \omega_L(X_h, X_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $X_h \notin \ker \omega_L$, and again the previous theorem implies that C_h is not FL -projectable. $\square$

To finish, we point out that our algebraic approach allow us to generalize all the results to the graded context, without changing a single word in our arguments.

Acknowledgements

JFC acknowledges partial financial support from Spanish DGI under project BFM-2000-1066-C03-01. HF thanks the Vicerrectoría de Investigación de la Universidad de Costa Rica for support.

References

- [1] C. Batlle, J. Gomis, J.M. Pons and N. Román-Roy, *Equivalence between the lagrangian and hamiltonian formalism for constrained systems*, J. Math. Phys. **27** (1986) 2953–2962.
- [2] P.G. Bergmann and I. Goldberg, *Transformations in phase space and Dirac brackets*, Phys. Rev. **98** (1955) 531–38.
- [3] J.F. Cariñena and J. Fernández-Núñez, *Geometric theory of time-dependent singular Lagrangians*, Fortschr. Phys. **41** (1993) 517–552.
- [4] J.F. Cariñena and H. Figueroa, *A geometrical version of Noether’s theorem in supermechanics*, Rep. Math. Phys. **34** (1994) 277–303.
- [5] J. F. Cariñena and H. Figueroa, *Hamiltonian versus Lagrangian formulation of supermechanics*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **30** (1997) 2705–2724.
- [6] J. F. Cariñena and H. Figueroa, *Geometric formulation of higher order Lagrangian systems in supermechanics*, Acta Appl. Math. **51** (1998) 25–58.
- [7] J. F. Cariñena and H. Figueroa, *Recursion operators and constants of motion in supermechanics*, J. Diff. Geom. and Appl. **10** (1999) 191–202.
- [8] J.F. Cariñena and C. López, *The Time-Evolution Operator for Singular Lagrangians*, Lett. Math. Phys. **14** (1987) 203–210.

- [9] J.F. Cariñena, C. López and E. Martínez, *A new approach to the converse of Noether's theorem*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **22** (1989) 4777–4786.
- [10] J.F. Cariñena, C. López and E. Martínez, *Sections along a map applied to Higher Order Lagrangian Mechanics. Noether's theorem*, Acta Appl. Math. **25** (1991) 127–151.
- [11] J.F. Cariñena, C. López and N. Roman–Roy, *Geometric study of the connection between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints*, J. Geom. Phys. **4** (1987) 315–334.
- [12] M. Crampin and F.A.E. Pirani, *Applicable Differential geometry*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series **59**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1988.
- [13] P.A.M. Dirac, *Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics*, Can. J. Math. **2** (1950) 129–148.
- [14] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, J. Marín-Solano, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, *Sections along maps in field theories. The covariant field operators*, e-print math-ph/0103019.
- [15] H. Figueroa, *Variedades graduadas y sus aplicaciones en supermecánica*, Ph. D. dissertation, Universidad de Zaragoza, July 1996, published in Publicaciones del Seminario Matemático García de Galdeano, serie II, sección 2, 55, (1997).
- [16] X. Gracia and J. M. Pons, *On an Evolution Operator connecting Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Formalisms*, Lett. Math. Phys. **17** (1989) 175–180.
- [17] X. Gracia and J. M. Pons, *Singular Lagrangians: some geometric structures along the Legendre map*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34** (2001) 3047–70.
- [18] L.A. Ibort and J. Marín-Solano, *Geometrical foundations of Lagrangian supermechanics and supersymmetry*, Rep. Math. Phys., **32** (1993) 385–409.
- [19] K. Kamimura, *Singular Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems, generalized canonical formalism*, Nuovo Cim. **68 B** (1982) 33–54.
- [20] B. Kostant, *Graded manifolds, graded Lie theory and prequantization*, in *Differential Geometrical Methods in Mathematical Physics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **570**, Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- [21] D. A. Leites, *Introduction to the theory of supermanifolds*, Russian Math. Surveys **35** (1980) 1–64.
- [22] Yu.I. Manin, *Gauge Field theory and Complex Geometry*, Nauka. Moscow, (1984). English transl., Springer–Verlag, New York, (1988).
- [23] M.C. Muñoz and N. Roman–Roy, *Lagrangian theory for presymplectic systems*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré **47** (1992) 27–45.
- [24] F. Pugliese and A.M. Vinogradov, *On the geometry of singular Lagrangians*, J. Geom. Phys. **35** (2000) 35–55.
- [25] O.A. Sánchez-Valenzuela, *Differential–Geometric approach to supervector bundles*, Comunicaciones Técnicas IIMASS–UNAM, (Serie Naranja) **457**, México, (1986).
- [26] R. Skinner, *First order equations for classical mechanics*, J. Math. Phys. **24** (1983) 2581–2588.

- [27] R. Skinner and R. Rusk, *Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics I. Formulation on $T^*Q \oplus TQ$* , J. Math. Phys. **24** (1983) 2589–2594.
- [28] A. Vaintrob, *Lie algebroids and homological vector fields*, Russ. Math. Surv. **52** (1997) 428–429.